UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,224	07/06/2001	Jeffrey D. Carr	17453US02	4002

23446 7590 10/31/2008

MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD
500 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 3400
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2436	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/31/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/900,224	CARR, JEFFREY D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PRAMILA PARTHASARATHY	2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *6* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,7,8,11-15,17 and 18* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,5,9,10 and 16* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on 7/03/2008. Presently Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 18 are pending (please refer to Allowable subject matter).

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 4, 5, 9 – 10, 16, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Prior art of record even in combination does not explicitly disclose the limitations of these claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's remarks filed on 7/03/2008 have been fully considered. Applicant arguments with respect to claim 15, is persuasive and claim objection is hereby withdrawn. Applicant argues that the dependent claims were fully not rejected as disclosed in the prior art Matsui et al (6,742116), the examiner maintains that a reasonable interpretation of the independent claims were rejected as detailed in the previous office action and The dependent claims are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims and by other reason set forth in this office action to read on Matsui as will be explained below. Accordingly, the rejection for the pending claims is respectfully maintained.

The instant invention claims “concealing a parameter transferred between a first and a second device” and the disclosure details that the parameter can be any secret or confidential data; encrypting (the parameter and control signal) at the first device, transmitting the encrypted parameter, receiving and using the control signal to decrypt the parameter signal and generating a destination parameter by decrypting the control signal.

Matsui teaches “generating a plurality of keys based on identifier (parameter) and a plurality of private keys (control signal) and storing the common keys generated such that each

common key is identifiable by an index which corresponds to a predetermined series of coordinated events, one index per common key" (see Matsui summary and Column 8 lines 17 – 65; column 10 line 50 – Column 11 line 46 and Column 14 line 57 - Column 15 line 56). Furthermore, Examiner suggests amending the Claims 4, 5, 9 – 10, 16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-3, 7-8 and 11 – 15, 17 – 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsui et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,742,116).

5. As per Claims 1, 7 and 13, Matsui teaches "generating, by the first device, a control signal and a parameter signal; encrypting or hashing by the first device a portion of the control signal with the parameter signal to generate an encrypted or hashed parameter signal and control signal; transmitting by the first device to the second device the control signal and the encrypted or hashed parameter signal and control signal; receiving by the second device form the first device the control signal and the encrypted or hashed parameter signal and control signal; using by the second device the control signal to decrypt or inversely transform the encrypted or hashed parameter signal and control signal; and generating by the second device a destination parameter signal depending upon a comparison of the control signal and decrypted or inversely transformed control signal" (Column 8 lines 17 – 65; column 10 line 50 – Column 11 line 46 and Column 14 line 57 – Column 15 line 56).

7. As per Claims 2-3, 8, 11 – 12 and 14 – 15, 17 – 18, claims are rejected by the virtue of their dependence on the rejected parent claims.

Furthermore, As per Claim 2, Matsui teaches, “generating by the first device a first key signal using the control signal; and wherein encrypting or hashing comprises using the first key signal (Column 8 lines 44 – 54).

As per Claim 3, Matsui teaches, “generating by the second device a second key signal using the control signal; and generating by the second device the destination parameter signal by decrypting or inversely transforming the encrypted or hashed parameter signal using the second key signal” (Column 9 lines 4 – 10).

As per Claim 8, Matsui teaches, “a key table module including indexed cryptographic keys, the key table module operably coupled to the control logic block, the key table module to generate a key signal using the control signal; and an inverse transformation module to generate the destination parameter signal by decrypting or inversely transforming the encrypted or hashed parameter signal using the key signal” (Column 8 lines 50 – 58 and Column 12 lines 2 – 9).

As per Claim 11, Matsui teaches, “wherein the control signal comprises a key index and the portion of the control signal comprises the key index” (Column 8 lines 44 – 54 and Column 12 lines 56 – 67).

As per Claim 12, Matsui teaches, “wherein the portion of the control signal comprises the key index” (Column 8 lines 44 – 54 and Column 12 lines 56 – 67).

As per Claim 14, Matsui teaches, “the first signal comprises a parameter signal and a portion of the control signal; the decrypted or inversely hashed signal comprises a decrypted or inversely transformed portion of the control signal and a decrypted or inversely transformed parameter signal; and the second device stores the decrypted or inversely transformed parameter signal depending on the comparison of a portion of the control signal received from

the first device and the decrypted or inversely transformed portion of the control signal" (Column 8 lines 50 – 58 and Column 12 lines 2 – 9).

As per Claim 15, Matsui teaches, "wherein the decrypted or inversely transformed portion of the control signal comprises the key index" (Column 8 lines 44 – 54 and Column 12 lines 56 – 67).

As per Claim 17, Matsui teaches, "wherein using at least a portion of the control signal to obtain a first cryptographic key comprises using the key index as an index into a data memory to retrieve the first cryptographic key from the data memory" (Column 8 lines 26 – 34).

As per Claim 18, Matsui teaches, "wherein the key index comprises an index into a data memory that is used to retrieve the second cryptographic key from the data memory" (Column 8 lines 26 – 34 and 42 – 65).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PRAMILA PARTHASARATHY whose telephone number is (571)272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. to 5:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pramila Parthasarathy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436
October 25, 2008